

Conformal fields and the stability of leaves with constant higher order mean curvature

Krzysztof Andrzejewski and Paweł G. Walczak

Abstract

In this paper, we study submanifolds with constant r th mean curvature S_r . We investigate, the stability of such submanifolds in the case when they are leaves of a codimension one foliation. We also generalize recent results by Barros - Sousa and Alías - Colares, concerning conformal fields, to an arbitrary manifold. Using this we show that normal component of a Killing field is a r th Jacobi field of a submanifold with S_{r+1} constant. Finally, we study relations between r th Jacobi fields and vector fields preserving a foliation.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 53C12, 53C42, 53C45.

Key words and phrases: foliations, r th mean curvature, stability, Killing, Jacobi fields.

1 Introduction

Let L be a submanifold of M with a unit normal vector field N and constant $(r+1)$ th mean curvature S_{r+1} . If M is the manifold with constant sectional curvature (Einstein manifold for $r=1$) then L is characterized by a variational problem (see, among the others, [1, 7, 8, 12]). Therefore, there is a natural question about the stability of L . In this paper, we give some criteria for the stability of such submanifolds in the case when they are leaves of a codimension one foliation (Theorem 3.2). Next, for a conformal vector field U we obtain the formula for $L_r(f)$, where $f = \langle U, N \rangle$, in the case of an arbitrary manifold (Theorem 4.1). Using this, we show that normal component of a Killing field is a r th Jacobi field of a submanifold with S_{r+1} constant (Proposition 5.2). Finally, we investigate relations between r th Jacobi fields and vector fields preserving a foliation - Section 5.

Throughout the paper everything (manifolds, foliations, metrics, etc.) is assumed to be C^∞ -differentiable and oriented. For simplicity, we usually work with S_r instead of its normalized counterpart H_r (see Remark 2.1). Repeated indices denote summation over their range.

2 Preliminaries

Let M be a $(n + 1)$ -dimensional Riemannian manifold, L be a codimension one submanifold of M and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ represent a metric on M . Assume that both M and L are oriented and let N be an orthogonal unit vector field. Let $\bar{\nabla}$ denote the Levi-Civita connection of the metric. Then $\bar{\nabla}$ induces the connection ∇ on the set $\Gamma(L)$ of all vector fields tangent to L . Define the second fundamental form (or, the shape operator) A of L with respect to N by

$$A : \Gamma(L) \rightarrow \Gamma(L), \quad A(X) = -(\bar{\nabla}_X N)^\top \quad \text{for } X \in \Gamma(L),$$

where $^\top$ denotes the orthogonal projection on the vector bundle tangent to L . Note that A is a self-adjoint linear operator and at each point $p \in L$ has real eigenvalues $\kappa_1(p), \dots, \kappa_n(p)$ (the principal curvatures). Associated to the shape operator there are n algebraic invariants given by

$$S_r(p) = \sigma_r(\kappa_1(p), \dots, \kappa_n(p)),$$

where σ_r for $r = 1, 2, \dots, n$ are the elementary symmetric functions given by

$$\sigma_r(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{i_1 < \dots < i_r} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r},$$

$\sigma_0 = 1$ and $\sigma_r = 0$ for other r . Moreover, observe that the characteristic polynomial of A can be written in terms of the S_r 's as

$$\det(tI - A) = \sum_{r=0}^n (-1)^r S_r t^{n-r}.$$

The normalized r th mean curvature H_r of L is defined by

$$H_r = S_r \binom{n}{r}^{-1}.$$

Remark 2.1 Sometimes H_r , instead of S_r , is called r th mean curvature.

Now, we introduce the Newton transformations $T_r : \Gamma(L) \rightarrow \Gamma(L)$ arising from the shape operator. They are defined inductively by

$$T_0 = I, \quad T_r = S_r I - A T_{r-1}, \quad 1 \leq r \leq n,$$

or, equivalently, by

$$T_r = S_r I - S_{r-1} A + \cdots + (-1)^{r-1} S_1 A^{r-1} + (-1)^r A^r.$$

Note that, by the Cayley-Hamilton theorem we have $T_n=0$. Furthermore, T_r is also self-adjoint and A together with all the T_r 's can be simultaneously diagonalized; if $e_1, \dots, e_n$ are the eigenvectors of A corresponding to the eigenvalues $\kappa_1(p), \dots, \kappa_n(p)$, respectively, then they are also eigenvectors of T_r corresponding to the eigenvalues $\mu_{i,r}(p)$ of T_r , that is $T_r(e_i) = \mu_{i,r}(p)e_i$, where

$$\mu_{i,r}(p) = \frac{\partial \sigma_{r+1}}{\partial x_i}(\kappa_1(p), \dots, \kappa_n(p)).$$

We say that T_r is definite (semi definite) if $T_r > 0$ or $T_r < 0$ on L ($T_r \geq 0$ or $T_r \leq 0$ on L).

The following algebraic properties of T_r are well known (see, for instance, [14]) and will be applied throughout this paper:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(T_r) &= (n-r)S_r = c_r H_r, \\ \text{Tr}(AT_r) &= (r+1)S_{r+1} = c_r H_{r+1}, \\ \text{Tr}(A^2 T_r) &= S_1 S_{r+1} - (r+2)S_{r+2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $c_r = (n-r) \binom{n}{r} = (r+1) \binom{n}{r+1}$.

Let $f \in C^\infty(L)$. Define operators L_r, J_r as follows:

$$L_r f = \text{Tr}(T_r \circ \text{Hess} f),$$

and

$$J_r f = L_r f + \text{Tr}(A^2 T_r) f + \text{Tr}(\overline{R}(N) T_r) f,$$

where $\overline{R}(N) : \Gamma(L) \rightarrow \Gamma(L)$ is given by

$$\overline{R}(N)(X) = \overline{R}(X, N)N, \quad X \in \Gamma(L),$$

and $\overline{R}$ being the curvature tensor of $\overline{\nabla}$. Then

$$L_r f = \text{div}(T_r \nabla f) - \langle \text{div} T_r, \nabla f \rangle,$$

where $\text{div} T_r = (\nabla_{e_i} T_r) e_i$, and we have the following cases (see, among the others, [4, 7, 9, 11, 12]).

For $r = 0$ we have $\text{div}_L T_0 = 0$ thus $L_r = L_0 = \Delta$

$$J_0 f = \Delta f + \text{Tr} A^2 f + \overline{\text{Ric}}(N) f.$$

If $r = 1$ and M is an Einstein manifold, then $\text{div} T_1 = 0$ and

$$J_1 f = \text{div}(T_1 \nabla f) + (S_1 S_2 - 3S_3) f + \text{Tr}(\overline{R}(N) T_1) f.$$

If M is a manifold with constant sectional curvature c , then for arbitrary r $\operatorname{div}(T_r) = 0$ and

$$J_r f = \operatorname{div}(T_r \nabla f) + (S_1 S_{r+1} - (r+2)S_{r+2})f + (n-r)cS_r f.$$

For these three cases we have the following proposition (e.g. [7]).

Proposition 2.2 *If L is compact without boundary or if L is noncompact and $f \in C_c^\infty(L)$ then*

$$\int_L L_r(f) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_L f L_r(f) = - \int_L \langle T_r \nabla f, \nabla f \rangle.$$

□

Next, we define

$$I_r(f, g) = - \int_L f J_r g,$$

for $f, g \in C_c^\infty(L) = \{f \in C^\infty(L) : f \text{ -- a compactly supported function}\}$.

Let us recall that a submanifold is r -minimal ($0 \leq r \leq n-1$) if $S_{r+1} = 0$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a codimension one foliation. We say that $\mathcal{F}$ is r -minimal if any leaf of $\mathcal{F}$ is a r -minimal submanifold of M . A foliation such that every leaf has constant $(r+1)$ th mean curvature is called r -tense.

Similarly, as for submanifolds, we may define S_r, H_r, T_r for a foliation $\mathcal{F}$ (e.g. [5, 6]). In this case, the functions S_r , are smooth on the whole M and, for any point $p \in M$, $S_r(p)$ coincides with the r -th mean curvature at p of the leaf L of $\mathcal{F}$ which passes through p ; therefore we will use the same notation for r th mean curvature of foliations and submanifolds. Finally, recall that a hypersurface L with $S_{r+1} = \text{constant}$, of a manifold with constant sectional curvature (Einstein manifold – for $r = 1$) is a critical point of the variational problem of minimizing the integral

$$\mathcal{A}_r = \int_L F_r(S_1, \dots, S_r),$$

for compactly supported volume-preserving variations, see [7, 8, 12]. The functions F_r are defined inductively by

$$\begin{aligned} F_0 &= 1, \\ F_1 &= S_1, \\ F_r &= S_r + \frac{c(n-r+1)}{r-1} F_{r-2}, \quad 2 \leq r \leq n-1. \end{aligned}$$

The second variation formula reads $\mathcal{A}_r''(0) = (r+1)I_r(f, f)$. Thus, we may introduce the following definition (see discussion in [1]).

Definition 2.3 We say that a submanifold L with $S_{r+1} = \text{constant}$ is r -stable if $I_r(f, f) \geq 0$ for all $f \in C_c^*(L)$ or if $I_r(f, f) \leq 0$ for all $f \in C_c^*(L)$. We say L is r -unstable if there exist functions $f, g \in C_c^*(L)$ such that $I_r(f, f) < 0$ and $I_r(g, g) > 0$; where

$$C_c^* = \{f \in C_c^\infty : \int_L f = 0\}. \quad (1)$$

0-minimal (0-stable) submanifold are simply called minimal (stable).

3 Stability results

Oshikiri [13] has showed that each leaf of a minimal foliation is stable. Now, we give a generalization of this theorem for arbitrary $r > 0$. In order to do this, we will need the following proposition ([5], see also [10]).

Proposition 3.1 *Let M be a Riemannian manifold with a unit vector field N orthogonal to the foliation $\mathcal{F}$ of M . Then on a leaf L we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}(T_r \bar{\nabla}_N N) &= \langle \operatorname{div} T_r, \bar{\nabla}_N N \rangle - N(S_{r+1}) + \\ &\quad + \operatorname{Tr}(A^2 T_r) + \operatorname{Tr}(\bar{R}(N) T_r) + \langle \bar{\nabla}_N N, T_r \bar{\nabla}_N N \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

□

If M is a manifold without boundary, then we have the following theorem.

Theorem 3.2 *Let M be an Einstein (a constant sectional curvature) manifold for $r = 1$ ($r > 1$) and $\mathcal{F}$ be a codimension one r -tense foliation of M . If on a leaf L , either $T_r \geq 0$ and $N(S_{r+1}) \leq 0$ or $T_r \leq 0$ and $N(S_{r+1}) \geq 0$, then L is r -stable.*

Proof. In our case from Proposition 3.1 we get

$$\operatorname{div}(T_r \bar{\nabla}_N N) = -N(S_{r+1}) + \operatorname{Tr}(A^2 T_r) + \operatorname{Tr}(\bar{R}(N) T_r) + \langle \bar{\nabla}_N N, T_r \bar{\nabla}_N N \rangle.$$

Thus, for any $f \in C_c^*(L)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}(f^2 T_r \bar{\nabla}_N N) - (T_r \bar{\nabla}_N N)(f^2) &= f^2 \operatorname{div}(T_r \bar{\nabla}_N N) \\ &= f^2 \operatorname{Tr}(T_r A^2) + f^2 \operatorname{Tr}(\bar{R}(N) T_r) + f^2 \langle \bar{\nabla}_N N, T_r \bar{\nabla}_N N \rangle - f^2 N(S_{r+1}) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Using Proposition 2.2, Eq. (2) and the fact that T_r is selfadjoint, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_L \langle T_r(\nabla f + f\bar{\nabla}_N N), \nabla f + f\bar{\nabla}_N N \rangle - f^2 N(S_{r+1}) \\
&= \int_L \langle T_r \nabla f, T_r \nabla f \rangle + 2f \langle T_r \nabla_N N, \nabla f \rangle + f^2 \langle T_r \bar{\nabla}_N N, \bar{\nabla}_N N \rangle - f^2 N(S_{r+1}) \\
&= \int_L -f L_r(f) + (T_r \bar{\nabla}_N N)(f^2) + f^2 \langle T_r \bar{\nabla}_N N, \bar{\nabla}_N N \rangle - f^2 N(S_{r+1}) \\
&= \int_L -f L_r(f) - f^2 \operatorname{Tr}(T_r A^2) - f^2 \operatorname{Tr}(R(N)T_r) + \operatorname{div}(f^2 \bar{\nabla}_N N) \\
&= I_r(f, f).
\end{aligned}$$

This ends the proof. $\square$

Note that, during the proof of Theorem 3.2, we did not use the condition from Eq. (1).

Corollary 3.3 *Let M be as in Theorem 3.2. If each leaf of the foliation $\mathcal{F}$ has the same constant $(r+1)$ th mean curvature (especially equal zero) and T_r is semi definite on M then any leaf of $\mathcal{F}$ is r -stable.*

There are various conditions enforcing (semi) definiteness of the operator T_r , see [2, 11]. One of them implies the following corollary.

Corollary 3.4 *Let M be as in Theorem 3.2 and $\mathcal{F}$ be a r -minimal foliation of M . If on a leaf L , $S_r \neq 0$, then L is r -stable.*

Example 3.5 Let $M = \mathbb{R} \times L$ be a foliated manifold each leaf of which is given by $\{t\} \times L$ where L has constant negative sectional curvature c . We define a metric on M by $\langle, \rangle = dt^2 + \cosh(\sqrt{-c}t)\langle, \rangle_L$. Then $(M, \langle, \rangle)$ has constant sectional curvature c and foliation is r -tense. Moreover, on any leaf L , $T_r \geq 0$ and $N(S_{r+1}) \leq 0$ or $T_r \leq 0$ and $N(S_{r+1}) \geq 0$, thus any leaf is r -stable.

Example 3.6 Let $M = \mathbb{R} \times L$ be a foliated manifold each leaf of which is given by $\{t\} \times L$, where L is flat manifold (e.g. $\mathbb{R}^n, T^n$). We define a metric on M by $\langle, \rangle = dt^2 + e^{-2at}\langle, \rangle_L$. Then $(M, \langle, \rangle)$ has constant sectional curvature $-a^2$, each leaf has the same constant S_{r+1} and P_r is definite; thus each leaf is r -stable.

Recall that by a singular foliation of M , we mean a foliation $\mathcal{F}$ of $M \setminus S$, where $S \subset M$ is a set of Lebesgue measure zero [10].

Example 3.7 Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a singular foliation of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ by the concentric cylinders $S^r(R) \times \mathbb{R}^{n-r}$, where $S^r(R)$ denotes the sphere with center $0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and radius $R > 0$; the singular set of the foliation is the $(n-r)$ -hyperplane $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-r}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Then $\mathcal{F}$ is r -minimal foliation and $S_r \neq 0$; consequently, any leaf is r -stable.

4 Conformal fields

Let U be a conformal vector field on a manifold M and $f = \langle U, N \rangle$. Recently, Barros - Sousa and Alías - Colares [3, 7] have obtained an expression of $L_r f$ when M is either a manifold with constant sectional curvature or generalized a Robertson-Walker spacetime. Now, we generalize these results to the case of arbitrary manifolds and obtain some other consequences.

Theorem 4.1 *Let L be a submanifold (not necessary a leaf) of an arbitrary manifold M with the unit normal vector field N . If U is a conformal vector field on M and $f = \langle U, N \rangle$, then*

$$J_r f = -U^\top(S_{r+1}) - (r+1)kS_{r+1} - N(k)(n-r)S_r,$$

equivalently

$$L_r f = -\langle U, \nabla S_{r+1} \rangle - f \operatorname{Tr}(A^2 T_r) - f \operatorname{Tr}(\bar{R}(N) T_r) - k \operatorname{Tr}(A T_r) - N(k) \operatorname{Tr}(T_r),$$

where $2k$ is the conformal factor of U .

Proof. Let $X \in \Gamma(T(L))$. Since U is a conformal field, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla f, X \rangle &= X(f) = \langle \bar{\nabla}_X U, N \rangle + \langle U, \bar{\nabla}_X N \rangle \\ &= -\langle X, \bar{\nabla}_N U \rangle + \langle U^\top, \bar{\nabla}_X N \rangle \\ &= -\langle X, \bar{\nabla}_N U \rangle - \langle U^\top, AX \rangle = -\langle X, (\bar{\nabla}_N U)^\top + AU^\top \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get

$$\nabla f = -((\bar{\nabla}_N U)^\top + AU^\top). \quad (3)$$

Let $p \in L$ be an arbitrary point and $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$ a local orthonormal frame such that $T_r(e_i(p)) = \mu_{i,r} e_i(p)$. By definition of L_r we have

$$(L_r f)(p) = \langle \nabla_{e_i}(\nabla f), T_r e_i \rangle(p),$$

where as everywhere, repeated indices denote summation.

Thus at the point p we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \nabla_{e_i}(\bar{\nabla}_N U)^\top, T_r e_i \rangle &= \langle \bar{\nabla}_{e_i}(\bar{\nabla}_N U)^\top, T_r e_i \rangle \\
&= \langle \bar{\nabla}_{e_i} \bar{\nabla}_N U, T_r e_i \rangle - \langle \bar{\nabla}_N U, N \rangle \langle \bar{\nabla}_{e_i} N, T_r e_i \rangle \\
&= \langle \bar{R}(e_i, N)U, T_r e_i \rangle + k \operatorname{Tr}(AT_r) + \langle \bar{\nabla}_N \bar{\nabla}_{e_i} U, T_r e_i \rangle + \langle \bar{\nabla}_{[e_i, N]} U, T_r e_i \rangle \\
&= \langle \bar{R}(e_i, N)U, T_r e_i \rangle + k \operatorname{Tr}(AT_r) + \langle \bar{\nabla}_N \bar{\nabla}_{e_i} U, T_r e_i \rangle \\
&\quad + \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\bar{\nabla}_{e_i} N} U, T_r e_i \rangle - \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\bar{\nabla}_N e_i} U, T_r e_i \rangle \\
&= \langle \bar{R}(e_i, N)U, T_r e_i \rangle + k \operatorname{Tr}(AT_r) + \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\bar{\nabla}_{e_i} N} U, T_r e_i \rangle \\
&\quad + \mu_{i,r}(\langle \bar{\nabla}_N \bar{\nabla}_{e_i} U, e_i \rangle - \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\bar{\nabla}_N e_i} U, e_i \rangle).
\end{aligned}$$

Since, for a fixed i we have $\langle \bar{\nabla}_{e_i} U, e_i \rangle = k$ and $\langle \bar{\nabla}_N e_i, e_i \rangle = 0$ thus

$$\langle \bar{\nabla}_N \bar{\nabla}_{e_i} U, e_i \rangle = -\langle \bar{\nabla}_{e_i} U, \bar{\nabla}_N e_i \rangle + N(k) = \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\bar{\nabla}_N e_i} U, e_i \rangle + N(k).$$

Consequently, at p we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \nabla_{e_i}(\bar{\nabla}_N U)^\top, T_r e_i \rangle &= \langle \bar{R}(e_i, N)U, T_r e_i \rangle + \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\bar{\nabla}_{e_i} N} U, T_r e_i \rangle + k \operatorname{Tr}(AT_r) + N(k) \operatorname{Tr}(T_r) \\
&= \langle \bar{R}(T_r e_i, N)U, e_i \rangle - \langle A e_i, e_j \rangle \langle (\bar{\nabla}_{e_j} U)^\top, T_r e_i \rangle + k \operatorname{Tr}(AT_r) + N(k) \operatorname{Tr}(T_r) \\
&= \langle \bar{R}(e_i, U)N, T_r e_i \rangle - \operatorname{Tr}(AT_r(\bar{\nabla} U)^\top) + k \operatorname{Tr}(AT_r) + N(k) \operatorname{Tr}(T_r) \quad (4)
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, from the Codazi equation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \bar{R}(e_i, U^\top)N, T_r e_i \rangle &= \langle (\nabla_{U^\top} A)e_i, T_r e_i \rangle - \langle (\nabla_{e_i} A)U^\top, T_r e_i \rangle \\
&= \langle (T_r \nabla_{U^\top} A)e_i, e_i \rangle - \langle \nabla_{e_i}(AU^\top), T_r e_i \rangle + \langle A(\nabla_{e_i} U^\top), T_r e_i \rangle \\
&= \operatorname{Tr}(T_r \nabla_{U^\top} A) - \langle \nabla_{e_i}(AU^\top), T_r e_i \rangle + \langle \bar{\nabla}_{e_i} U^\top, AT_r e_i \rangle \\
&= U^\top(S_{r+1}) - \langle \nabla_{e_i}(AU^\top), T_r e_i \rangle - \langle \bar{\nabla}_{e_i}(fN), AT_r e_i \rangle + \langle \bar{\nabla}_{e_i} U, AT_r e_i \rangle \\
&= U^\top(S_{r+1}) - \langle \nabla_{e_i}(AU^\top), T_r e_i \rangle + f \langle A e_i, AT_r e_i \rangle + \langle \bar{\nabla}_{e_i} U, AT_r e_i \rangle \\
&= U^\top(S_{r+1}) - \langle \nabla_{e_i}(AU^\top), T_r e_i \rangle + f \operatorname{Tr}(A^2 T_r) + \operatorname{Tr}(T_r A(\bar{\nabla} U)^\top).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \nabla_{e_i}(AU^\top), T_r e_i \rangle &= -\langle \bar{R}(e_i, U^\top)N, T_r e_i \rangle + U^\top(S_{r+1}) \\
&\quad + f \operatorname{Tr}(A^2 T_r) + \operatorname{Tr}(T_r A(\bar{\nabla} U)^\top). \quad (5)
\end{aligned}$$

Since $AT_r = T_r A$, we have

$$\operatorname{Tr}(T_r A(\bar{\nabla} U)^\top) = \operatorname{Tr}(AT_r(\bar{\nabla} U)^\top). \quad (6)$$

Finally, from Eq. (4),(5) and (6) we get at the point p

$$\begin{aligned} L_r f &= \langle \nabla_{e_i}(\nabla f), T_r e_i \rangle = -\langle \bar{R}(e_i, U)N, T_r e_i \rangle + \langle \bar{R}(e_i, U^\top)N, T_r e_i \rangle \\ &\quad - U^\top(S_{r+1}) - f \operatorname{Tr}(A^2 T_r) - k \operatorname{Tr}(A T_r) - N(k) \operatorname{Tr}(T_r) \\ &= -f \operatorname{Tr}(\bar{R}(N)T_r) - f \operatorname{Tr}(A^2 T_r) - U^\top(S_{r+1}) - k \operatorname{Tr}(A T_r) - N(k) \operatorname{Tr}(T_r). \end{aligned}$$

Since p is arbitrary, the assertion follows. $\square$

Corollary 4.2 *When U is a Killing field we get*

$$J_r(f) = -U^\top(S_{r+1}) = -\langle \nabla S_{r+1}, U \rangle.$$

For further applications see Proposition 5.2 and Corollary 5.6.

5 Jacobi fields

Let M be an arbitrary manifold and L be a submanifold of M with a unit orthogonal field N . Then the operator J_r induct a new mapping (denotes also J_r) $J_r : \Gamma(T(L)^\perp) \rightarrow \Gamma(T(L)^\perp)$ as follows

$$J_r(fN) = J_r(f)N.$$

Definition 5.1 We say that $V \in \Gamma(T(L)^\perp)$ is a r th Jacobi field of L if $J_r(V) = 0$. We say that $V \in \Gamma(T(\mathcal{F})^\perp)$ is a r th Jacobi field of $\mathcal{F}$ if is a r th Jacobi field for any leaf L of $\mathcal{F}$.

Proposition 5.2 *Let L be a submanifold of an arbitrary Riemannian manifold M , such that S_{r+1} is constant on L , then the normal component $U^\perp$ of a Killing vector field U is a r th Jacobi vector field.*

Proof. The proof follows immediately from Corollary 4.2. $\square$

Theorem 5.3 *Let M be an arbitrary Riemannian manifold and $\mathcal{F}$ be a foliation of M whose leaves have the same constant $(r+1)$ th mean curvature (e.g. zero). If $V \in \Gamma(TM)$ preserves $\mathcal{F}$ (i.e. maps leaves onto leaves) then $V^\perp = fN$ is a r th Jacobi field of $\mathcal{F}$.*

Proof. Since V is foliation preserving, $[V, \Gamma(T(\mathcal{F}))] \subset \Gamma(T(\mathcal{F}))$ so $\nabla f + f\bar{\nabla}_N N = 0$ on any leaf L . Using this and Proposition 3.1, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
J_r f &= L_r f + f \operatorname{Tr}(A^2 T_r) + f \operatorname{Tr}(\bar{R}(N) T_r) \\
&= \operatorname{div}(T_r(\nabla f)) - \langle \operatorname{div} T_r, \nabla f \rangle + f \operatorname{Tr}(A^2 T_r) + f \operatorname{Tr}(\bar{R}(N) T_r) \\
&= \operatorname{div}(T_r(\nabla f)) + f \operatorname{div}(T_r \bar{\nabla}_N N) - \langle \operatorname{div} T_r, \nabla f + f \bar{\nabla}_N N \rangle \\
&\quad - f \langle \bar{\nabla}_N N, T_r \bar{\nabla}_N N \rangle \\
&= \operatorname{div}(T_r(\nabla f + f \bar{\nabla}_N N)) - \langle \operatorname{div} T_r, \nabla f + f \bar{\nabla}_N N \rangle \\
&\quad - \langle \nabla f + f \bar{\nabla}_N N, T_r \bar{\nabla}_N N \rangle = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Example 5.4 Let $M = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ ($M = \mathbb{R} \times T^n$) be a foliated manifold which leaves are $\{t\} \times \mathbb{R}^n$. For functions $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we may define a metric $\langle, \rangle$ on M

$$\langle, \rangle = dt^2 + e^{-2 \int \phi_i(t) dt} (dx^i)^2.$$

Then, $S_{r+1} = \sigma_{r+1}(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n)$. So we have a lot of metrics such that S_{r+1} is constant on M . Then, a vector field $V = f(t) \frac{\partial}{\partial t}$ is $\mathcal{F}$ foliation preserving and consequently V is r th Jacobi field. Note that, V is not a Killing field (in general) and we could not use Proposition 5.2.

Proposition 5.5 *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a foliation of a Riemannian manifold M whose leaves are closed and have the same constant $(r+1)$ th mean curvature. If on any leaf L operator T_r is definite and $\operatorname{div}(T_r) = 0$, then any r th Jacobi fields of $\mathcal{F}$ preserves $\mathcal{F}$.*

Proof. If $V = fN$ is a r th Jacobi field, then $J_r(V) = 0$ thus $I_r(f, f) = 0$ on each leaf L . On the other, as in the proof of Theorem 3.2, we get

$$\int_L \langle T_r(\nabla f + f \bar{\nabla}_N N), \nabla f + f \bar{\nabla}_N N \rangle = I_r(f, f).$$

Thus V is foliation preserving. □

For example, if $M = \mathbb{R} \times T^n$ and the metric and foliation are as in Example 5.4, then $\nabla_F A = 0$ for any $F \in \Gamma(T(L))$. Consequently $\operatorname{div}(T_r) = 0$ on any leaf (although M need not be a manifold with constant sectional curvature).

Corollary 5.6 *Under the assumptions of Proposition 5.5, if U is a Killing field on M then U preserves $\mathcal{F}$.*

References

- [1] Alencar, H., do Carmo, M., Elbert, M.F.: Stability of hypersurfaces with vanishing r -mean curvatures in euclidean spaces. *J. reine. angew. Math.* **554**, 201-216 (2003)
- [2] Alencar, H., Santos, W., Zhou, D.: Curvature integral estimates for complete hypersurfaces. *arXiv math.DG/0903.2035*, 1-19 (2009)
- [3] Alías, L.J., Colares, A.G.: Uniqueness of spacelike hypersurfaces with constant higher order mean curvature in generalized Robertson-Walker spacetimes. *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **143**, 703–729 (2007)
- [4] Alías, L.J., de Lira, S., Malacarne, J.M.: Constant higher-order mean curvature hypersurfaces in Riemannian spaces. *Journal of the Inst. of Math. Jussieu* **5**(4), 527–562 (2006)
- [5] Andrzejewski, K., Walczak, P.: The Newton transformation and new integral formulae for foliated manifolds. To appear in *Ann. Global Anal. Geom.*
- [6] Andrzejewski, K., Walczak, P.: Extrinsic curvatures of distributions of arbitrary codimension. *ArXiv math.DG/0908.1714* (2009)
- [7] Barbosa, J.L.M, Colares, A.G.: Stability of hypersurfaces with constant r -mean curvature. *Ann. Global Anal. Geom.* **15**, 277-297 (1997)
- [8] Barros, A., Sousa, P.: Stability of r -minimal cones in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. *J. Geom. Phys.* **58**, 1407-1416 (2008)
- [9] Barros, A., Sousa, P.: Compact graphs over a sphere of constant second order mean curvature. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **137**, 3105-3114 (2009)
- [10] Caminha, A., Sousa, P., Camargo, F.: Complete foliations of space forms by hypersurfaces. *arXiv math.DG/0908.078*, 1-11 (2009)
- [11] Cheng, X., Rosenberg, H.: Embedded positive constant r -mean curvature hypersurfaces in $M^m \times \mathbb{R}$. *An. Acad. Brasil. Cien.* **77**(2), 183–199 (2005)
- [12] Elbert, M.F.: Constant positive 2-mean curvature hypersurfaces. *Ill. J. Math.* **41**, 247-267 (2002)
- [13] Oshikiri, G.: Jacobi fields and the stability of leaves of codimension-one minimal folitions. *Tohoku. Math. Journ.* **34**, 417-424 (1982)

- [14] Rosenberg, H.: Hypersurfaces of constant curvature in space forms. Bull. Sci. Math. **117**, 211–239 (1993)

Krzysztof Andrzejewski (corresponding author)

Institute of Mathematics, Polish Academy of Sciences

ul. Śniadeckich 8, 00-956 Warszawa, Poland

and

Department of Theoretical Physics II, University of Łódź

ul. Pomorska 149/153, 90 - 236 Łódź, Poland.

e-mail: k-andrzejewski@uni.lodz.pl

Paweł G. Walczak

Institute of Mathematics, Polish Academy of Sciences

ul. Śniadeckich 8, 00-956 Warszawa, Poland

and

Faculty of Mathematics and Informatics, University of Łódź

ul. Banacha 22, 90-238 Łódź, Poland

e-mail: pawelwal@math.uni.lodz.pl